

REMARKS

In the Office Action of September 26, 2007, Figs. 1 and 2A-2C were objected to because only that which is old is illustrated in these figures. Figs. 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 11 were also objected to because circles and squares in these figures must allegedly be labeled. In addition, the disclosure was objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.71 as allegedly being incomprehensible as to preclude a reasonable search of the prior art by the Examiner. Furthermore, claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the disclosed invention is allegedly inoperative and therefore lacks utility. Claims 1-12 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,999,421 (hereinafter "Liu").

With respect to the drawing objections, Applicants hereby submit a replacement sheet of drawings for Figs. 1 and 2A-2C in which these figures include the legend "(Prior Art)". However, with respect to the Figs. 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 11, Applicants respectfully assert that there is no requirement that squares or circles used in drawings must be labeled. If there is in fact such a requirement, Applicants respectfully request the relevant section(s) of authority be cited. Otherwise, Applicants respectfully request that the drawing objections with respect to Figs. 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 11 be withdrawn.

With respect to the objection to the disclosure, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited passage in paragraph [0040] clearly describes how the emulated current IE is to be used. As described in paragraph [0041], the switch controller 1 "controls the switch CF to switch on and off with a repetition period T and a duty cycle δ ." Thus, the emulated current IE is used by the switch controller 1 to control the switch CF. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the disclosure be withdrawn.

With respect to the Section 101 rejections of claims 1-12, Applicants have amended Fig. 3 to show that the emulated current IE is used by the switch controller 1 to control the switch CF. Thus, a dotted line has been drawn from the generator 2, which generates the emulated current IE, to the switch controller 1, as can be seen in

the replacement sheet of drawings for Fig. 3. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 101 rejections of claims 1-12 be withdrawn.

With respect to the Section 102 rejections of claim 1-12, Applicants
5 respectfully assert that each claimed element of the independent claim 1 is not disclosed in the cited reference of Liu, as explained below. Thus, the independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Liu. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims 1-12 be allowed.

10 I. Patentability of Independent Claim 1

The independent claim 1 includes the limitations of “*a generator for generating an emulated signal based on timing information representing the repetition time and the duty cycle to emulate a current signal being representative of*
15 *the inductor current,*” “*a comparator for comparing the emulated signal with the current signal to obtain an error signal*” and “*a generator controller for receiving the error signal to supply a control signal to the generator for adapting a property of the emulated signal to become substantially equal to a property of the current signal,*” which are not disclosed in the cited reference of Liu. Thus, Applicants respectfully
20 assert that the independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Liu, and request that the independent claim 1 be allowed.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.
25 *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The cited reference of Liu discloses a dual-channel power system. However, the dual-channel power system of Liu does not use “*an emulated signal based on*
30 *timing information representing the repetition time and the duty cycle to emulate a current signal being representative of the inductor current,*” as recited in the independent claim 1. Thus, the power system of Liu does not include “*a generator,*” “*a comparator*” or “*a generator controller,*” as recited in the independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the independent claim 1 is not

anticipated by the cited reference of Liu, and request that the independent claim 1 be allowed.

II. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-12

5

Each of the dependent claims 2-12 depends on the independent claim 1. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of the independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim 1.

10

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

15

Respectfully submitted,
Halberstadt et al.

20

Date: December 26, 2007

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300